



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,440	02/28/2006	Marc Husemann	101769-309-WCG	3424
27386 7590 10/08/2010 GERSTENZANG, WILLIAM C. NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, PA 875 THIRD AVE, 8TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022				
EXAMINER DESAL, ANISH P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1788				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/08/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1. **Continuation of Box 11:**

2. On page 2 of the after-final (AF) amendment, applicant argues "Regarding numbered paragraph 5 of the Advisory Action, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Wallner teaches...definitely taking place." (see first full paragraph).

3. In response, the Examiner submits that, even if applicant is correct in his assertion which the Examiner does not agree with, it is noted that the presently claimed invention is obvious for the following reasons: the function of Wallner's antistatic polymers and Akhter's electrical particles is same, namely to dissipate electrical charge (column 1 lines 25-40 and column 2 lines 55-60 of Wallner, column 1 lines 5-10 and column 3 lines 5-10 of Akhter). Additionally, Wallner already makes clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that incorporation of antistatic agent in the adhesive will result in inferior adhesive (see column 1 lines 55-59). As such since Wallner is the primary reference being modified, one of ordinary skill in the art who is in possession of Wallner recognizes that Wallner does not desire addition of antistatic agents (i.e. ionogenic polymer of Wallner or conductive particles) in the adhesive. Based on this, the Examiner respectfully submits that while Akhter may teach of adding conductive particles (antistatic agent) in both the primer layer and the PSA layer, one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes not to add conductive particles of Akhter in the PSA of Wallner. It is submitted that it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose... [T]he idea of combining them

flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art (see MPEP 2144.06). As such, applicant's arguments are not found persuasive.

4. Additionally, on page 2 of the AF amendment, applicant argues "Regarding numbered paragraphs 7/8, Applicants are not speculating. According to the drawing the electrical conductive particles are at least as thick as the adhesive layer. In the case of Akhter the adhesive layer is between 20 and 75  $\mu\text{m}$ . Therefore the particles have at least the same size and are therefore visual." (see third full paragraph).

5. In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that applicant's arguments are not found persuasive because there is no factual evidence that if one were to add the conductive particles of Akhter in the adhesive of Wallner, the resultant adhesive of Wallner would not remain transparent. Accordingly, applicant's arguments are not found persuasive and the art rejections are sustained.

/A. D./

Examiner, Art Unit 1788

/Callie E. Shosho/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1787